Volume Title
ASP Conference Series, Vol. **Volume Number**
Author
© **Copyright Year** Astronomical Society of the Pacific

arXiv:1406.4711v1 [astro-ph.SR] 18 Jun 2014

Planetary companions to sdB stars

Roberto Silvotti[1], Roy H. Østensen[2], John H. Telting[3], and Christophe Lovis[4]

[1]*INAF–Osservatorio Astrofisico di Torino, via dell'Osservatorio 20, 10025 Pino Torinese, Italy*

[2]*Instituut voor Sterrenkunde, KU Leuven, Celestijnenlaan 200D, 3001 Leuven, Belgium*

[3]*Nordic Optical Telescope, Apartado 474, 38700 Santa Cruz de La Palma, Spain*

[4]*Observatoire de Genève, Université de Genève, 51 Ch. des Maillettes, 1290 Sauverny, Switzerland*

Abstract. The formation of single sdB stars is an unresolved issue and the presence of close sub-stellar companions could explain the stellar envelope ejection near the tip of the RGB, that is needed to form an sdB star. In the last 6 years the first planets orbiting sdB stars were detected using different methods. In this article we will discuss these recent discoveries, review the different detection methods used, and present some preliminary results obtained with Harps-N, which allows to reach an unprecedented accuracy in radial velocity measurements.

1. SdB planets, detection methods, and the a – M_P diagram

Even though only a small fraction of stars, about 2% (Heber 1986), become extreme horizontal branch stars and subdwarf B (sdB) stars in particular, there are at least two good reasons to search for, and study, substellar companions to sdB stars: **1)** the envelope ejection that is needed to form an sdB star is well explained in terms of close binary evolution for half of the sdBs that have a close stellar companion, generally an M-dwarf or a white dwarf (Han et al. 2002, 2003). But it is more problematic for the other half of apparently single sdB stars. The presence of close and massive planets or brown dwarfs (BDs) is a possible explanation (Soker 1998), that seems corroborated by recent calculations from Han et al. (2012). Their Fig. 1 shows that, near the peak distribution of sdB masses at ~0.47 $M_\odot$ (Fontaine et al. 2012; Van Grootel et al. 2013), a low-mass sub-stellar companion may be sufficient to eject the common envelope (CE), even when only the orbital energy released during the spiral-in is considered. Adding an extra term due to thermal energy, the minimum companion mass to eject the CE is further reduced. **2)** The fate of close-in planets after the red giant (RG) expansion of their parent star is not known and observational constraints are required to test the models. Stellar mass loss and tidal interactions play a crucial role determining whether the planets migrate outwards or inwards. In the latter case the planets transfer angular momentum to the star's envelope, start accreting material, and finally enter the RG



Figure 1. Orbital distance vs planetary mass (or $M_P \sin i$ when the inclination is unknown). The BD/planet candidates fall in 3 well separated regions, corresponding to 3 different detection methods: RVs (5 upper-left green dots); timing (8 upper-right dots, 3 from pulsation timing in red and 5 from eclipse timing in pink), and illumination (5 lower-left blue dots with Earth-like masses detected with *Kepler*, including three new candidates from Silvotti et al. 2013 in cyan). For each method current observational limits are shown: 1 km/s RVs in green, 3 and 30 s for *p*- and *g*-mode pulsation timing in red, 40 ppm for reflection using different Bond albedos (α_B) and mean planet densities (d) in blue. The blue lines do not include differential re-emission from heated day-side vs cooler night-side hemisphere, which is actually the mean source of photometric variations for sdB stars. This is why the blue dots are below the detection limits (see Charpinet et al. 2011 and Silvotti et al. 2013 for more details). The green line at 50 m/s represents the limit that can be reached with Harps/Harps-N (see Section 2). Colors available in the electronic version only.

envelope. Here their survival depends on various factors, first of all on their original mass. The opposite effects of stellar mass loss and tidal interactions determine a gap in the final distribution of orbital distances and periods (Villaver & Livio 2009; Nordhaus & Spiegel 2013).

The first detections of substellar companions to sdB stars started six years ago and now we have about fourteen sdB stars with eighteen planet/BD candidates belonging to three different groups, well distinct in terms of orbital distance and planetary mass (Fig. 1). In order of decreasing orbital distance we find: i) eight planet/BD candidates in wide orbits (orbital periods between 3.2 and ~16 yrs), with masses between ~2 and ~40 M_{Jup} (Silvotti et al. 2007; Lee et al. 2009 and Beuermann et al. 2012b; Qian et al. 2009 and Beuermann et al. 2012a; Qian et al. 2012; Beuermann et al. 2012a; Lutz 2011). ii) Five Earth-size planet candidates, likely remnants of planetary cores, in close orbits (orbital periods between 5.3 and 19.5 hours), detected by the *Kepler*

spacecraft (Charpinet et al. 2011; Silvotti et al. 2013). iii) At least five BD candidates with very short orbital periods between 1.8 and 7 hours (Geier et al. 2012 and references therein). These three groups correspond to three different detection methods: timing (both pulsation timing and eclipse timing), illumination effects, and radial velocities (RVs) respectively, that sample three different regions of the $\mathbf{a - M_P}$ (semi-major axis vs planetary mass) plane (Fig. 1). More details concerning the pulsation timing and the EXOTIME program are given by Schuh et al. (these proceedings).

2. Pushing down the RV limits with Harps-N

What is immediately evident from Fig. 1 is that the central region of the $\mathbf{a - M_P}$ diagram is completely unexplored. The easiest way to access this region is to push down the present limits on radial velocities. This is not an easy task considering that:
1) sdB stars are generally faint;
2) because of radiative levitation, heavy element abundances vary by order of magnitudes from one star to another. And a large number of metal lines is required in order to measure low RVs (H and He lines are too broad to be of any utility).
3) A significant fraction of sdB stars do pulsate so that RV variations of $\approx 10^2$-10^3 m/s can be caused by stellar pulsation.

Despite these limits, a small sample of bright (V<12), single, nonpulsating, metal-rich, and slowly rotating sdB stars exists. We recently started a program to observe them with Harps-N, an instrument almost identical to ESO-Harps (with a ∼10% higher efficiency), mounted at the 3.6m *Telescopio Nazionale Galileo* (TNG). A few preliminary results obtained in the first run with Harps-N are shown in Fig. 2 and 3. These results demonstrate that, with a careful selection of the targets, we can measure the precise wavelength of up to 200-300 lines in the sdB spectra and thus, through the cross correlation technique, reduce the RV errors to 10-20 m/s, allowing to measure 50-100 m/s at 5σ level. In Fig. 3 we see that two targets, PG 0044+097 and PG 0342+028, show significant RV variations. While PG 0342+028 was recently found to be a *g*-mode pulsator (E. Green, private comm.) and therefore the variations that we see are likely due to stellar oscillations, PG 0044+097 is a good candidate to host a sub-stellar companion. Further observations of this star will allow to confirm the presence of the companion and measure the orbital period and $M_P \sin i$. The third star shown in Fig. 3, UV 00512-08, has constant RVs at ±30 m/s level, suggesting that the cross correlation technique works well.

3. Discussion and future

An important step to study the sdB planets is to check whether the gap in orbital periods/distances predicted by different authors (e.g. Nordhaus & Spiegel 2013) exists or not and which are its boundaries. As shown in Fig. 1, the current data can not answer this question and we need new planet/BD candidates, in particular in the central region of the $\mathbf{a - M_P}$ diagram, where we do not have any candidate yet. We have seen in Section 2 that one way to start sampling the central region of the $\mathbf{a - M_P}$ diagram is to improve the RV precision.

The reason why, apparently, the close-in planets are divided into two groups with very different masses (Fig. 1) is another interesting aspect that could be related only to



Figure 2. Cross correlation function (ccf) using 212 lines from four Harps-N spectra of PG 0044+097. The right plot shows in detail the ccf minima. Each color (visible only in the electronic version) corresponds to one spectrum. The gaussian fits of the ccfs, from which RVs are derived, are represented by dashed lines.

the different detection methods used, but could also indicate that two different classes of objects exist that survived the engulfment: those with a sufficient mass to not have been significantly altered in their structure, and those with a lower mass that have been disrupted in one or more fragments of planetary cores. A method to verify whether close-in substellar companions to sdBs are relatively common is to search for transits. In the *Kepler* sdB sample of 49 objects (including a few He sdBs), 2 show signatures of remnants of planetary cores (Charpinet et al. 2011; Silvotti et al. 2013). But only 15 pulsating sdBs of the *Kepler* sample have been observed for a time sufficiently long to detect very low photometric variations of 20-50 ppm. Assuming that 2/15 of sdBs have remnants of planetary cores at a=0.005 AU from the star with $R_P << R_{sdB}$ and R_{sdB}=0.001 AU (i.e. a transit probability of 0.2), the probability to observe a transit is about 0.027, which means that, on average, we need to observe ∼40 sdB stars to see one transit. Considering now the more massive group of sub-stellar companions, Geier et al. (2012) found that 16% of their sample of 27 bright single-lined sdB stars do show small RV variations, that can be associated with massive sub-stellar companions. But in this case the transit probability at 0.005 AU is about 0.28 (assuming R_P=0.9 R_{Jup}, Burrows et al. 2011, and including a ∼10% inflation of the companion, see e.g. Geier et al. 2009). So that, on average, 1 sdB out of ∼20 should show transits (and secondary eclipses).

Finally it is worth mentioning that most of the planet/BD candidates in Fig. 1 were found using only one detection method. To confirm them with an independent method would be very important. A discussion of this crucial aspect is given by Schuh et al. (these proceedings).

Acknowledgments. The authors thank the organizers for a very fruitful and pleasant sdB/sdO meeting.

References

Beuermann, K., Breitenstein, P., Bski, B. D., et al., 2012a, A&A, 540, A8



Figure 3. Radial velocities for three of our targets. See text for more details.

Beuermann, K., Dreizler, S., Hessman, F. V., Deller, J., 2012b, A&A, 543, A138
Burrows, A., Heng, K., Thane Nampaisarn, T., 2011, ApJ, 736, 47
Charpinet, S., Fontaine, G., Brassard, P., et al., 2011, Nature, 480, 496
Fontaine, G., Brassard, P., Charpinet, et al., 2012, A&A, 539, A12
Geier, S., Edelmann, H., Heber, U., Morales-Rueda, L., 2009, ApJ, 702, L96
Geier, S., Classen, L., Brünner, P., et al., 2012, ASP Conf. Series, 452, 153
Han, Z., Podsiadlowski, Ph., Maxted, P. F. L., Marsh, T. R., Ivanova, N., 2002, MNRAS, 336, 449
Han, Z., Podsiadlowski, Ph., Maxted, P. F. L., Marsh, T. R., 2003, MNRAS, 341, 669
Han, Z., Chen, X., Lei, Z., Podsiadlowski, P., 2012, PASP Conf. Series 452, 3
Heber, U., 1986, A&A, 155, 33
Lee, J. W., Kim, S.-L., Kim, C.-H., et al., 2009, AJ, 137, 3181
Lutz, R., 2011, PhD thesis, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, (http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/diss/2011/lutz/lutz.pdf)
Nordhaus, J., Spiegel, D. S., 2013, MNRAS, 432, 500
Qian, S.-B., Zhu, L.-Y., Zola, S., et al., 2009, ApJ, 695, L163
Qian, S.-B., Zhu, L.-Y., Dai, Z.-B., et al., 2012, ApJ, 745, L23
Schuh, S., Silvotti, R., Lutz, R., Kim, S.-L., 2014, these proceedings
Silvotti, R., Schuh, S., Janulis, R., et al., 2007, Nature, 449, 189
Silvotti, R., Østensen, R. H., Telting J. H., et al., 2013, A&A, submitted
Soker, N., 1998, AJ, 116, 1308
Van Grootel, V., Fontaine, G., Charpinet, S., et al., 2013, in European Physical Journal Web of Conferences, 43, 4007
Villaver, E., Livio, M., 2009, ApJ, 705, L81